

generalized type of great antiquity, and thus unites in itself characters of Phyllopoda, Copepoda, and Decapoda.

The specimen found by me, which was over $\frac{1}{2}$ inch in length, has the carapace extending back to about the third abdominal segment on the sides, but with a rather wide dorsal sinus. The beak is large and well developed. The eyes are similar to those of *N. bipes* of Europe, being situated on movable peduncles, and formed of numerous crystalline bodies under a common cornea. The antennæ are furnished with numerous hairs on their peduncles. The superior pair have a peduncle of two joints, the last of which bears two appendages, consisting of:—(1) a short triangular joint, with spines on its outer margin, and an oval ciliated plate; and (2) a slender flagellum of several articulations, the number of which were not made out. The inferior antennæ consist of a peduncle of three stout joints (the second of which bears a large tooth on its upper margin, while the terminal one is furnished with rows of spines and hairs on its outer margin and a bunch of hairs at its extremity), and a long slender flagellum, consisting of between 70 and 80 articulations, and almost equal in length to the whole body. The branchial feet, which were apparently very slender, were completely concealed beneath the carapace. The third to the seventh (inclusive) abdominal segments have their posterior margins finely dentated. The four pairs of natatory feet have the peduncles largely developed; and their branches bear a row of spines on each outer margin. The caudal appendages also have a row of spines on each side, and are terminated by several long filaments, which are minutely plumose.

Pale yellow in colour and semitransparent. Length 0·35 inch.

EXPLANATION OF PLATE XIX. FIGS. 7-9.

Fig. 7. *Nebalia longicornis.* × 10.

Fig. 8. The same, base of superior antennæ. × 20.

Fig. 9. The same, base of inferior antennæ. × 20.

XLVIII.—*More Moot Points in Ornithological Nomenclature.*

By ALFRED NEWTON, M.A., F.R.S., &c.

NOMENCLATURE is so trifling an adjunct to zoology that no true student of the science can fail to grudge the time which he is, on certain occasions, compelled to bestow upon it, or ought to be ungrateful to those who have expended their toil in preparing some rules for his guidance through the intricate maze

of synonyms that, from one cause or another, enfolds almost every object with which he has to deal. Of such rules, the code adopted by the British Association, after the consultation of almost every eminent naturalist at home and abroad, and after more than twenty years' deliberation, is naturally that to which the student turns, and is that by which, if he has any respect for the opinion of others, he will be governed. In one very small department of zoology I have tried to carry out these rules; and I am glad to say that my efforts so far have been favourably regarded by many of my fellow-workers. It is, however, impossible to please everybody; and two of my friends lately deemed it their duty to demur to some of the decisions at which, in obedience to that code, I had arrived. Their objections I essayed to answer without delay (*suprà*, pp. 158-163); and from the communications of several correspondents I judge that my reply has been pretty generally considered to be conclusive. I then said that I had no desire to convert my critics; and I certainly had no expectation that I should do so. On the other hand, I did not anticipate that one of them would so immediately begin to prefer a fresh series of charges against me, such as I find in 'The Ibis' for October, which reached me yesterday, and this, I may remark, without deigning to take any direct notice of my former reply. I am now accused of disturbing nomenclature by changes which are both "frivolous" and "revolutionary," of having (in conjunction with others) "gradually undermined" the principles of the aforesaid code, of being guilty of "flagrant offences" in violation of the same, of pursuing a "reckless course," of "corrupting the ornithological morality" (whatever that may mean) of the age, and generally of high crimes and misdemeanors. I therefore ask the dispassionate attention of the readers of this journal while I try to clear myself from the charges upon which I am thus peremptorily arraigned—premising that, with all the humility which ought to be displayed by a defendant, I shall not throw back hard words on my assailant.

Mr. Seebohm's opinions I do not wish to influence; but it is incumbent on me to correct his assertions when they are contrary to fact. He may think that the code of the British Association requires amendment—even to the extent of five "riders" to be added to one rule—or total abolition; and I have no desire to check the utterance of his expression; but when he states (*Ibis*, 1879, p. 429) that, "to make confusion more confounded," Mr. Sharpe followed my "unfortunate lead" through two volumes of his 'Catalogue of Birds,' I am bound to say that out of *thirty-four* species of *Accipitres*

treated in common by that gentleman and myself, his nomenclature differs from my own in *thirteen* instances, including the important cases of *Syrnium* and *Strix**. The fact that Mr. Sharpe did not follow me further is not only a proof of his wholly independent action, but a disproof of the imputation of his ever following me "blindly." Whatever epithet may be applied to my "lead," it is surely Mr. Seebohm's statement that is "unfortunate."

Leaving, however, my supposed copartners in crime to answer for themselves, and for their eyesight, which none can doubt they are competent to do, I will proceed to the charges now brought against me personally by Mr. Seebohm. Formidable as they seem, examination reduces them to two †, of which one is the old story—the proper scientific name to be given to the Greater Whitethroat. I really hoped I had disposed of this before ‡; but although he has never adduced an atom of evidence in support of his assertion (which fact does not much surprise me, seeing that none is forthcoming), Mr. Seebohm still maintains that "Pl. Enl. 581. fig. 1" is "unintelligible" (which fact has the contrary effect). He is absolutely obdurate on this point, and will hear not Moses or the prophets. In vain for him have Temminck and Kuhl, Bonaparte and Gray, Gerbe and many others written. What was intelligible to them is not so to Mr. Seebohm; but as it is no part of my business to find any of my friends in intelligence, I will here dismiss the matter, merely suggesting, as a subject of curious inquiry on the part of those who have leisure, whether, if the beloved and "familiar" name "*Phylloscopus rufus*" be not set aside, owing to the prior use of its

* On the subject of the nomenclature of the *Strigide* I may perhaps be allowed to remark that, in the same number of 'The Ibis,' an editorial notice (p. 480) assumes that Forster's first application of the name *Bubo ignavus* to the Eagle-Owl was made in his "second catalogue" (p. 46), ignoring the fact of its use in his "first catalogue" (p. 3), which duly bears date 1817. This fact must be deemed conclusive. Those, however, who are curious as to the date of the "second catalogue" (to my mind so needlessly called in question) may like to know that the copy of the work in the library of the Linnean Society, containing (like my own) both catalogues in the original binding, is included in the list of "Additions" to the library of that Society, printed at the end of the 12th volume of its 'Transactions' (p. 590), which volume bears date 1817, and is therefore undeniable evidence of the "second catalogue" having been published in that year—unless, indeed, ground be shown for doubting the identity.

† The question whether we should write "*Acrocephalus aquaticus* (Gmel.)" or "*Acrocephalus aquaticus* (Temm.)" seems scarcely to require notice.

‡ I wish here to correct a misprint in my former paper (*suprà*, p. 161, line 13): "reniges" should be "rectrices."

trivial term, might not Rule 11 of the code apply to it? To call a species "*rufus*" which has not a shade of that colour about it certainly has the appearance of implying "a false proposition."

The next and last specific charge is that concerning *Acrocephalus arundinaceus*; and herein I at once claim an acquittal, since Mr. Seebohm has himself pronounced my decision to be "legal" and confesses that its legality has been "indorsed" by at least half a dozen other writers.

It would be an easy matter to extend my remarks to the rest of Mr. Seebohm's diatribe, and to criticise his proposed "riders," five in number, to the unhappy Rule 12, which at present falls so short of his desires. I would only observe thereon that there may be a something worse than "judges' law," namely law which is not judges'. Would-be legislators on nomenclature must take a wider view of the subject than ornithology only affords; but I cannot stop to establish that position. My inclination is not towards controversy; I have little time to spare; and, lastly, I am deeply affected by one of Mr. Seebohm's statements. He declares (pp. 430, 431), doubtless from experience of his own case, that the blunders of ornithologists are "pretty much in the direct ratio of the amount of work they do." This declaration should make all of us cautious; for it may be true in other cases.

Mr. Seebohm is greatly averse from any change of established custom. So am I; but I want to know what establishes custom; and, if he favours the readers of 'The Ibis' with another dissertation on nomenclature, I hope he will define what he means by "general use." It is not enough that all ornithologists have hitherto agreed to regard a certain figure as a representation of a certain species: Mr. Seebohm says the figure is "unintelligible;" and so all their opinions ("general use" notwithstanding) are to go for nothing. He objects to my carrying out rules "without regard to consequences"—or, in other words, impartially—that it is "reckless." In his eyes obedience to a code is a "flagrant offence" in violation of it. He finds me pursuing a strictly "legal" course; hence he terms that course "revolutionary" and wishes (pp. 429, 430) to alter the rules to suit his views of what the rules ought to be. If there is not here as nice a "derangement of epitaphs" as any Mrs. Malaprop would desire, I hardly know where else it can be found.

Magdalene College, Cambridge,
November 3, 1879.